

ATTACHMENT F

Pat Hines
21 Shirley Lane
Yerington Nevada 89447
702 375-2402

After reading the minutes of the June 23rd and April 20th meetings of Board of prison Commissioners I realize how important these minutes are to me and other Nevadans interested in the DOC responsibilities. They are informative and easy to read. Being out of state right now I am presenting to you some current DOC concerns that needing your consideration.

More **ongoing statistics need to be requested and received from DOC staff** for your use in determining whether agency policies , procedures and programs are beneficial cost saving and meet their intended goals. This information needs to be shared with Nevadans periodically via website and after quarterly meetings by the media. Comparing factual periodic statistics can be a useful tool in tool in evaluating agency accountability. Monitoring and accountability for the Doc has declined for the past few years even with this Board in place having regular quarterly meeting and Dr. James Austin's repeatedly asking for DOC statistics for his very professional endeavors to evaluate our DOC and offer best practice solutions.

Reflecting back I am so pleased that persistent efforts of advocates and families of the incarcerated helped bring two recommended DOC improvements become reality . Those were lower telephone rates from incarcerated offenders and that meetings of this Board are now video conferenced to Southern Nevada. Concern here is that some of the current DOC issues will not have to be brought to your attention so many times before they too materialize.

As a step to more transparency in our Nevada Government, I and many other citizens request that this Board **put your quarterly and special meetings on the "Live Broadcast List"** in order that working and home body people can view/hear them live. I asked how this is done and was told it is requested at the time a meeting room is arranged for a specific day.

Another transparency improvement for your consideration is to **initiate changing**

the requirement timefor posting scheduled meetings be changed from the current 3 business days requirement to 7 business days prior to the meeting to seven days prior. Website posting was one small step toward better transparency. IF a meeting notice is posted it needs to be done in a location known and accessible to those not working for the government. Some interested individuals do not have personal computers and are still receiving the requested notice via snail mail a day or so after the meeting . Some people call to find out about a meeting. They are told it is on a certain agency website spending considerable time trying to find the location to no avail.

There has been a dramatic change in text development of DOC Administrative Regulations the past four years. Current example. This meeting 52 ARs are present for consideration. Which numbers are up for consideration are not known until the DOC website posting three days prior to the meeting. No one , including Board members, could read and digest changes to this much paperwork appropriately enough to make a beneficial decision by meeting date. **THE REQUEST IS TO POST THE ARS UP FOR THE NEXT MEETING AT THE SAME TIME THE NEXT MEETING DATE IS POSTED.** Currently they are posted at the same time as the Agenda , three working days prior to the meeting. This will allow for more review time for all interested. I am still confused on who is supposed to have benefitted by the changes gradually being put in place the last few years. Vital data like who has the assigned duties, time frames for actions, investigations being done, getting medical inquiry feedbacks in a timely manner, who an inmate should go to review his/her Departmental Records. (AR 568) currently up for consideration is a good example of a current one just stripped of vital specific information. I have a hefty collection of past AR texts and try to compare the old and new text.

I so appreciate and thank Secretary Ross for his request that those in attendance at the April 20th meeting be given the opportunity to address ARs at the time they are under discussion. This has been proposed several times previously and should be made standard procedure. DOC staff seems to have

some means to get input in regarding ARs. IT IS PAST TIME OFFENDERS AND THEIR FAMILIES AND FRIENDS HAVE REPRESENTATION ON AN AR DEVELOPMENT BOARD if one exists.

Since I am currently out of state I am taking this written opportunity to request that the following two proposed AR changes **AR 278 (OFFENDER STORE FUNDS) OFFENDER STORE COFFEE SHOP OPERATION REIMBURSEMENT** to the General Fund and **AR 279 INMATE WELFARE FUNDS** (I am assuming word/words are missing) be sent **back the AR Development Committee for reconsideration**. It needs to be determined whether the proposed changes of these well established funds would no longer meet the goals of the legislative original intent.

SUGGESTION: (not the first time presented) Put more offenders to work in the operation of these functions thus eliminating some staff positions here which would lessen the cost of staff benefits, uniforms , overtime and vacation time. I heard that the AR Committee was disbanded and that the Inmate Advisory Committee is no longer functioning. Is my information true or false? An AR development committee needs a diverse perspective representation among its members. We have seen reduction in many DOC areas such as visitation time, lack of inmate job and education opportunities, lack of access to law libraries, gyms are closed, limitations placed on religious activities, One wonders what constructive activities remain to curb boredom and depression and encourage offenders to avoid activities that can lead to discipline problems.

Assuming that what I read (news articles) that at Ely and Lovelock there is prisoner overcrowding. Yet Jean sits unused, HDSP has 2 units empty (700 empty beds) , and Casa Grande and most of the ten camps are less than 60 % utilized. AT one time there was talk of enlarging Warm Springs. With the amount of unused facilities available as I just mentioned is this plan projection still being considered?

I have heard and participated in discussion for ways of better utilization of our prison facilities for at least four years. I again request **that DOC and the**

legislature develop lower classification requirements for offender placement in minimum security level facilities. Perhaps this Board is the appropriate requester to initiate a BDR for the next legislative session. As it has in many states this action would lessen the need for more hard beds and lower the cost of incarceration of many eligible offenders. I haven't check for over a year –is Nevada still at the top of the list as the state having the highest percentage of its incarcerated housed in maximum facility levels?

No, I have not forgotten the never ending problems with inferior medical and dental help, seemingly excessive inmate transportation or possible incorrect hole time authorized. This Board needs to consider some of the issues mentioned by myself and others from the general public and take action on those which seem to offer viable alternatives.

Looking at my outlined list I have 9 more issues. I have several ideas to consider with 9 to be left for next time. To assure you are made aware of concerns from the general public I would like to make one more request. **That request is that the next time in AR 105 (BOARD OF PRISON COMMISSIONERS MEETING) comes up for change (it s been revisited many times since its inception) that there be inserted a method for a member of the general public to submit realistic concerns and solution suggestion to a designated person within 10 days AFTER a board meeting. Then if the suggestion is worthy of your attention I recommend it be included on the next Board of Commissioners agenda. That way it will not be three or more months before the issue is considered.**

The push for more Government transparency is on. Support for it is being encouraged . Support for it from Mr. General Public is getting stronger.

Respectfully Submitted

Pat Hines